



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

grammatical punctuation. Rhetoric may over-ride grammar at its pleasure, but its effects are conditioned by the grammar it over-rides, or else it merely postures in a vacuum.

Dissent tho we may from the position that Dr. Summey has taken at the outset of his manual, we cannot charge him with any lack of consistency in its development. In accordance with his opinion that punctuation "is concerned not with grammatical but with rhetorical classification," he thruout frankly limits himself to the rhetorical aspect of his subject. Even of what he calls "etymological pointing" he says (p. 139), "The present chapter is not a compendium of rules. Its purpose is only to point out the more usual customs, with the rhetorical considerations applicable to whatsoever set of styles one may happen to follow." Perhaps we should merely be grateful for what is by far the most satisfactory treatment of one important side of punctuation; but one cannot but regret, at least from the standpoint of the searcher for a usable text-book, that Dr. Summey's philosophy did not permit him to provide his brilliant exposition of the rhetoric of punctuation with the solid if less exciting substructure of its grammar and orthography.

ROBERT L. RAMSAY

University of Missouri

A *GUIDE TO RUSSIAN LITERATURE*. By Moissaye J. Olgin. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920. 8vo., xiv+323 pages.

The book under review, casually opened, suggests the text-book or biographical dictionary. It contains between its covers notes on about fifty writers, arranged in three chronological groups, each preceded by a general survey. The temporal limits of the book are 1820-1917. Although Russian literature begins with Lomonosov (1711-1765), who has aptly been called the Peter the Great of Russian letters, this Guide to Russian Literature begins with the much later Pushkin. The reason, though not stated by the author, is that Russian literature, as far as it is of interest to the western world, starts with this great poet. Yet, within the bounds which the author has thus set himself there are, however, very flagrant omissions. He has not limited himself to writers of *belles lettres*, but has included even those who have written on social, economical, and political questions. His omission, therefore, of political writers, such as Herzen (1812-1879), who has justly been called the Russian Voltaire, Bakunin (1814-1876), the founder of modern anarchism, and of Kropotkin, the theoretician of the anarchist movement, cannot be excused. Nikolai Chernyshevsky (1828-

1889), who has to his credit, in addition to numerous political and economic writings, the epoch-making novel *What Is to Be Done*, has also been overlooked. It is still more inexcusable for an author of a handbook to Russian literature, who claims to be of Ukrainian birth, to omit the great Ukrainian poet Shevchenko (1814-1861). The ground covered, however, is less important than the way in which it is covered. The treatment is disconnected. The paragraphs in the general surveys of the three periods, into which he divides the Russian literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, are brief and perfunctory. The biographical and critical notes on the individual authors and on their individual works are superficial and unoriginal. The only passages worth reading are the judgments of Russian critics, which the author has rendered into English without, however, giving the sources on which he has drawn.

The author's lack of critical acumen is best proven by his denial of foreign influence on the Modernist or Symbolist movement in Russian literature, on a school, which, as he himself admits, is a "total deviation of Russian literary tradition," and "stands out as something apart in Russian literature." As a matter of fact, the writers of Russia, as of all other countries of Europe, turned for inspiration to France, where the literature of the last century reached its highest perfection. Towards the end of the century, however, Russia partly repaid its debt to France. The introduction of neo-Christian ideas into French literature was due to the influence of Russian writers. The author's failure to admit foreign influence on Russian literature must be accounted for by his ignorance of literatures other than his own. His unfamiliarity with French literature may be seen from the fact that he calls Villiers de l'Isle-Adam¹ a poet and refers to Flaubert's *St. Anthony's Trials* (instead of *The Temptation of St. Anthony*).

The author apparently has a way all his own in translating foreign titles into English. He gives English equivalents to the original Russian titles with total disregard of the titles under which they have already appeared in English. This brings the present reviewer to point out the fundamental fault of this so-called *Guide to Russian Literature*. A book written in English with the avowed aim of assisting English readers in their study of Russian literature must present mainly if not wholly that part of Russian literature which is accessible in English garb, and submit a list of English translations of each work under the different titles under which it has been introduced to English readers. From the book under review, however, the reader will gain no idea as to whether a Russian work in which he has become interested is or is not accessible to him in his own lan-

¹The name is misspelled in the book.

guage. Even if it is to be had in an English version, he is apt not to recognise it under the title which the author of the *Guide* has given it. The claim of the author that his book is to serve as a guide also to publishers and translators is absurd. Even these gentlemen must first know whether or not a Russian work already has been translated before they will venture to present it to English readers.

The author's transliteration of Russian names is as unsatisfactory as his translation of Russian titles. The present reviewer has elsewhere protested against the Babel in the English rendition of Russian words, as may be found in American newspapers and magazines (cf. "The Gloom and Glory of Russian Literature," *The Open Court* of July, 1918). The sound *ch* (as in *church*) is preceded in the book under review by the letter *t* if it is not initial. This lack of uniformity is still more evident when we find the forms Soloviov and Solyviov on one and the same page (p. 161). This, however, may be a typographical error, as is the word *batting* (man's soul is painfully batting against the day). Errors of idiom and of punctuation likewise abound. The first names of authors are not given except where it is necessary to distinguish between two authors with the same family name. We thus have Alexey Tolstoi and Leo Tolstoi. Now why in the name of heaven our author insists upon giving this great Russian writer a non-Russian name while he himself clings to his Russian name of Moissaye is not altogether clear.

The appendix on juvenile literature in Russia is rather juvenile. His personal reminiscences, with which this section starts, are out of place, and his suggestions for English translations of Russian fairytales are superfluous.

Withal the book makes a very bad impression, and every admirer of Russian literature will be sorry for this so-called *Guide to Russian Literature*. What puzzles the present reviewer most is the way in which this book has been advertised. To call it "the most comprehensive and authoritative introduction to Russian literature and Russian thought accessible in any European tongue" is simply absurd. The statement of the publishers that "there are few men in Europe or America who write with equal authority on the whole subject of Russian life and literature" suggests a credulousness on their part which borders the pathetic.

MAXIMILIAN J. RUDWIN

New York